



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,272	08/26/2008	Hakan Fortell	43314-240767	8687
26694	7590	11/29/2011		
VENABLE LLP P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998			EXAMINER AMIN, BHAVESH V	
			ART UNIT 3664	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/29/2011	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/593,272

Applicant(s)

FORTELL ET AL.

Examiner

BHAVESH V. AMIN

Art Unit

3664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/c3)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. **Claims 1, 3 & 5-6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al., US Patent 5,333,242 (hereafter referenced as Watanabe), in view of Brantmark et al., US patent 4,888,708 (hereafter referenced as Brantmark) and in view of Takahashi et al., US Patent 6,330,493 B1 (hereafter referenced as Takahashi).

Regarding **claims 1 & 3** where it is disclosed by Watanabe to have the method and system for:

"A system/method including at least two manipulators each programmed to carry out a plurality of tasks [figure 1], the system comprising, a handheld control tool [column 4 lines 30-40] for manually manipulating the manipulators, said hand held control tool

comprising a communication unit configured to communicate with the control system/method [column 4 lines 30 -49], wherein each manipulator is movably oriented in a first coordinate system, wherein a second coordinate system is defined for each manipulator so that one part of each manipulator stands still in the second coordinate system, and wherein each second coordinate system is movable relative to the first coordinate system [column 4 lines 49-68 & column 5 lines 1-68], and a controller configured to control the manipulators such that the manipulators move together in a synchronized motion when one of the manipulators is moved, wherein the control system is configured to select one of said manipulators as a leading manipulator, create a memory list including all remaining manipulators that are to be moved synchronously with the leading manipulator, receive a movement command from the hand held control tool [column 4 lines 15-68], create a move order for the leading manipulator, based on the received movement command and a current position of the leading manipulator [column 4 lines 15-68], and create move orders for the remaining manipulators in the memory list, such that parts of the manipulators, which stand still in the second coordinate systems, are moved such that the parts maintain positions relative to the second coordinate system of the leading manipulator [column 5 lines 1 – 68 & column 6 lines 1 – 68]."

It is not specifically disclosed by Watanabe to have a hand held device and this is disclosed by Brantmark in figure 4. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Watanabe by Brantmark to

allow for the programming device to be portable and easily carried by the user of the robot.

Where Watanabe and Brantmark do not specifically disclose their system having the robots move in synchronous mode, this is disclosed by Takahashi in column 5 where it describes how one of the robots can be set as the master and the other robots follow the master robot by synchronizing their movements in relation to the master robot. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Watanabe and Brantmark by Takahashi to allow for better control of the robots and also make it easier for the programmer to efficiently control many robots without having to program all of them individually to be in synchronized motion with the another robots.

Regarding **claim 3**, this is the corresponding method claim for apparatus claim 1 and is thus rejected for the same reasons as stated for claim 1 above.

Regarding **claims 5 & 6** where it is further disclosed by Takahashi to have numerous robot as shown in the figures 1-3 and thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Watanabe and Brantmark by Takahashi to allow for better control of the robots and also make it easier for the programmer to efficiently control many robots without having to program all of them individually to be in synchronized motion with the another robots.

Claims 2 & 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe and furth in view of Brantmark.

Regarding **claims 2 & 4** where all the limitations of claims 1 & 3 are disclosed by Watanabe, Brantmark and Takahashi, where Brantmark discloses the further limitation of, "hand held control tool comprises a manipulator input means in a form of a joystick." This is disclosed by Brantmark in figure 4; thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Watanabe, Brantmark and Takahashi by Brantmark to allow for the programming device to be portable and easily carried by the user of the robot.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BHAVESH V. AMIN whose telephone number is (571)270-3255. The examiner can normally be reached on M - T, Friday off, 7:30am to 6:00pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Khoi Tran can be reached on 571-272-6919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BHAVESH V AMIN/
Examiner, Art Unit 3664
/KHOI TRAN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3664